

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 6, 10, 14, and 15 are amended herein.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 3-15 are currently pending and under consideration.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 6 AND 9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claim 6 is amended herein to overcome the claim objection.

In view of the above, it is respectfully requested that the objection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 14 AND 15 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(B) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY GORE ET AL. (US 5,128,878)

According to claim 14 of the present invention, a display method comprises “allowing a user to designate a portion of an image stored by a server,” “extracting, by the server, the designated portion,” and “transmitting the designated portion to a client for display thereon.” Similarly, claim 15 of the present invention describes “allowing a user to designate a portion of an image stored by a server for display by a client,” “extracting and resizing, by the server, the designated portion for display by the client,” and “transmitting the designated resized portion to a client for display thereon.”

In item 12 on page 15 of the Office Action, the Examiner suggests that the above claimed features are disclosed in column 7, line 56 – column 8, line 29 and column 6, lines 12-32, 47-68 of Gore et al. (“Gore”). However, nothing in Gore describes the features recited in claims 14 and 15 of the present invention.

For example, the system of Gore has a client workstation 210 on a client side of the system and a file server 230 and plot server 250 on a server side of the system. Gore clearly describes that operation is begun when a user selects the Rplot command on a pop-up menu that appears on the *client workstation display* (see column 7, lines 56-59) on the client side of the system. Gore does not disclose that the user is designating a plot (or image) stored by the file server 230 or plot server 250. In fact, Gore discloses that the size of the plot is obtained according to the size of the current viewport on the *workstation display* (see column 8, lines 8-

11). “The viewport is that portion of normalized device coordinate space currently displayed on the *client workstation*” (emphasis added, see column 8, lines 11-13). “The *client workstation* display focuses on a specific portion of the complete space and can “zoom in” or “zoom out” on that space” (emphasis added, see column 8, lines 16-19).

Therefore, it is evident from the above-described disclosure that Gore does not disclose that the user is designating a plot (e.g., image) stored by the file server 230 or plot server 250, that the file server 230 or plot server 250 extracts a viewport (e.g., designated portion), or that the viewport is transmitted to the client workstation 210. Accordingly, Gore does not disclose the features of “allowing a user to designate a portion of an image stored by a server,” “extracting, by the server, the designated portion,” and “transmitting the designated portion to a client for display thereon” as recited in claim 14 of the present invention.

Further, the Examiner believes that Gore discloses the claimed invention at column 6, lines 12-32, 47-68. As indicated by the Examiner, Gore discloses that the server converts a request and arguments, runs the requested service, packages the results, and send them back to the client (see column 6, lines 25-29).

However, the “arguments” are not images. Moreover, Gore runs a lower level routine of the program to complete task, which are called “stubs.” This program is run at the client workstation. The stubs translates all of its arguments into a form suitable for network transmission called a message, then establishes contact with a server program on the same client workstation or another workstation, and sends the arguments to the server. The “arguments” are not stored by the server, nor does the server extract any designated portion of the arguments to transmit to the client workstation. The server of Gore is merely provided to receive a translated message from the client workstation to allow the user to complete a task at its workstation. Therefore, the disclosure in column 6, lines 13-29 further describes that Gore is fundamentally different from the claimed invention.

Accordingly, Gore does not disclose the features as recited in claims 14 and 15 of the present invention.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 3, 6, 7, 10 AND 11 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER SCHAUSER (US 6,661,855) IN VIEW OF GORE ET AL. (US 5,128,878)

Claim 1 of the present invention relates to “[a] display processing apparatus which converts generated original server image data and transmits the converted data to a client

display device, comprising: a server extraction unit extracting only a designated portion of a display result to be displayed on the client display device as display data from the original image data by determining a display region with vertical-to-horizontal length ratios and corner coordinate rounding calculations for a designated display area of the client display device; and a transmission unit transmitting the client display data to the display device."

Schauser is concerned with having remote access and control of remote systems in a network and updating of display information on remote systems. Schauser discloses that any changes on a host desktop can be seen in a client browser window. Thus, it is possible to transparently work from any client on the remote host (see column 3, lines 40-42). According to Schauser, the source computer 2 and remote computer 4 can have the same characteristics of performance because either the source computer 2 or the remote computer 4 may implement the detection and updating of changes.

By contrast, the present invention allows a user to designate a portion of the high-resolution image for display on a client display device that does have not the same performance characteristics as the server (such as lower processing speed, storage capacity or resolution). The image data portion designated by the user is a part of the original high-resolution image that is of interest to the user. The user-designated portion of the original image data is extracted from the high-resolution original image by the server. That is, less than all of the original image data is extracted and sent, improving image transmission speed/efficiency over transmitting the entire image. The extracted portion is then proportionately changed in size by the server to fit the client device, such as having a lower resolution (coarse-grained data).

Schauser is merely concerned with the detection of changes to the desktop 8 of the source processing system 2 and forwarding the detected changes to the remote processing system 4. Schauser discloses that either the source processing system 2 or the remote processing system 4 may implement the detection and updating of changes. Schauser provides a CPU 12 in the source processing system 2 for determining if there are changes or updates to the information displayed on the display screen or desktop, such as desktop 8 of the source computer 2. Schauser discloses that a portion of the currently displayed image is compared to a corresponding portion of a previously displayed image to determine if changes have occurred. In fact, this comparison of the currently displayed image to the previously displayed image is done at the source computer 2 and only thereafter, are the changes stored and/or forwarded to the remote computer 4. Therefore, there is no extracted designated portion of displayed result

at the source computer 2 to be transmitted to the remote computer 4 like in the present invention.

Accordingly, the present invention provides a server extraction unit to extract only a display result to be displayed on a client display device from an original image data of the server, whereas Schauser is concerned with detecting if a change or updates have been displayed on the display screen of a source computer and transmitting it to the remote computer so that the remote computer has the same changes. Therefore, Schauser does not disclose the features as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

It is described in section III above that Gore is completely silent regarding the claimed server extraction unit. Therefore, Schauser and Gore, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the features as recited in claim 1 of the present invention.

Similar to claim 1, claims 6 and 10 provides, "extracting, by a server only a designated portion of a display result to be displayed on the client display device as client display data from the original image data by determining a display region with vertical-to-horizontal length ratios and corner coordinate rounding calculations for a designated display area of the client display device; and transmitting the client display data to the client display device." Therefore, Schauser and Gore, either alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the features as recited in claims 6 and 10 of the present invention.

Claims 3, 7, and 11 depend from independent claims 1, 6, and 10, respectively, and patentably distinguish over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons as claims 1, 6, and 10.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

V. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4, 5, 8, 9, 12 AND 13 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(A) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER SCHAUSER (US 6,661,855) IN VIEW OF GORE ET AL. (US 5,128,878) IN VIEW OF OMORI (US 6,246,421)

Dependent claims 4 and 5 (depending from claim 1), 8 and 9 (depending from claim 6), and 12 and 13 (depending from claim 10) recite patentably distinguishing features of their own, and further, are at least patentably distinguishing due to their dependencies from independent claims 1, 6, and 10.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VI. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that each of the claims patentably distinguishes over the prior art, and therefore defines allowable subject matter. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection along with an indication of allowability of all pending claims are therefore respectfully requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 3-9-07

By: Derrick L. Fields
Derrick L. Fields
Registration No. 50,133

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501